

Meeting notes from the March 23, 2005 LRM Standards Committee

(NDOR Materials and Testing Conference Room)

Attendance:

Gail Knapp	City of Omaha, Planning
Larry Zink	GIS Steering Committee
Jim Langtry	Lancaster County Engineer's Office
Scott Richert	Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds Office
Jim Koch	NE Dept. of Property Assessment and Taxation
Cori Jandara	Terrascan, Inc.
John Beran	State Surveyor's Office
Jillian Walker	Terrascan, Inc.

Agenda:

1) Review and approval of the meeting notes

2) Review adopted language on Data Format Standard.

a. **Draft Spatial Data Format Standard.** A broad range of state and regional applications require property parcel information. Many of these applications require the combining of data across jurisdictional boundaries. To facilitate these applications, the property parcel spatial (graphic) data should be either maintained in a manner that allows it to be readily integrated in a common geographic data format (i.e., shapefile) or be capable of being exported into a common geographic data format (i.e., shapefile).

3) Property Parcel Attributes

- a. PARCELNO versus LOCATIONID in NPAT data
- b. Identifying draft attribute needs (county abstracts)
- c. FGDC Cadastral Standards (Handout)
- d. Identifying attribute needs of other non-local government entities
- e. Need to identify standards/guidelines for other local government attribute needs?

4) Define Future Advisory Committee Focus

- a. Future Agenda Items
 - i. Ortho vs. PLSS??
- b. Outreach and Review Process?

5) Next Adv. Cmte. Mtg. Date (Wed., Apr. 20th, 1:00PM, NDOR Material and Testing Conference Room)

Meeting started at 1:01 pm

Introductions:

Everyone at the meeting introduced themselves.

1) Review and approval of the meeting notes:

Minutes were approved as written.

2) Review adopted language on Data Format Standard:

Larry reviewed the drafted language for the data format standard for those who were not in attendance at the last meeting. Everyone in approved the draft.

3) Property Parcel Attributes

a. PARCELNO versus LOCATIONID in NPAT data:

Jim Koch clarified the difference between the PARCELNO and LOCATIONID, in which the PARCELNO is the cadastral map number and the LOCATIONID is the county computer generated record number. Jim suggested that if lines 18-26 are combined a unique number is created. Larry asked whether that unique number (lines 18-26) is a PID number? Jim answered no, it's not the PID number. Line 24 (Market) seems to be out of place and should be shorted to ID#. Larry asked were does the county PID appear on the state sales file? Jim indicated that it is not a requirement of NPAT. There was a review of the 521 form to see if there was spot for the County PID. There was not a spot for the County PID on the form. Scott remarked that Lancaster County writes the PID number on the top of the 521 form. Larry suggested that there needs to be area to include the County PID number on the form. Jillian Walker commented that Terrascan carries 5 different types of unique ID numbers.

b. Identifying draft attribute needs (county abstracts, Form 45):

Scott passed out the Lancaster County 2004 abstract and the instructions for filling out Form 45, the county abstract. Scott went through the abstract and highlighting which attributes were being accessed to fill out the form. Mr. Zink thanked Scott for his report but indicated that this is not what the committee was after.

c. FGDC Cadastral Standards (Handout):

Larry handed out the recent (March 2005) Cadastral Core Data Draft Report by the FGDC. Larry suggested that the committee review this document and use it as a jumping off point for identifying attribute needs of other non-local governments.

d. Identifying attribute needs of other non-local government entities:

The committee came up with the following attributes which may be needed by other non-local government entities:

PID#

Situs Address

Owner Address
 Legal Description
 Assessed Value
 Land Value
 Area (Deeded)
 Property Class (Res, Urban, Ag, Com, Rec)
 Property Sub-class (Dryland, Irrigated, Grassland/Pasture, Waste)
 Ownership type
 Tax District
 School District (County/City)
 Districts (Other)
 Landuse (PAT)
 Status (Vacant, Improved or Improved only)
 Location (Urban, Sub-urban, Rural)
 City Size
 Sale ID
 Section
 Township
 Range
 *All NPAT Attributes

Jim Langtry mentioned the rows as well as centrally assessed properties are not captured in the Lancaster County GIS system.

e. Need to identify standards/guidelines for other local government attribute needs:

Larry suggested that the committee review the FGDC document and determine if there is a need add additional attributes.

4) Define Future Advisory Committee Focus

a. Future Agenda Items

i. Ortho vs. PLSS??

Larry asked the group whether there was a spatial accuracy problem and that the PLSS system was probably the best and that both should be used. Larry asked the group if this section should be enhanced? There was also some discussion of the Standard vs Guideline issue. It was suggested by Mr. Zink that maybe at the end of Section F, Ortho –base that “See recommended Map Standards” should be added at the end of that section.

b. Outreach and Review Process?

Larry asked how the standards be distributed to the broader community, should they be distributed now or should we wait until funding becomes available? Jim Koch suggested that the standards should be run by NPAT and their vendor. Larry suggested that the committee needs to identify folks to review the document when complete.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:01 PM

Next Meeting:

Next Adv. Cmte. Mtg. Date (Wed., Apr. 20th, 1:00PM, NDOR Material and Testing Conference Room)

Respectively Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott E. Richert". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Scott E Richert
Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds